DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 047 669 JC 710 057

AUTHOR Case, Chester H.
TITLE Beyond Evaluation: The Quality Control Model of Evaluation and the Development Model for Faculty Growth and Evaluation.
PUB DATE Jan 71
NOTE 16p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Evaluation Criteria, *Evaluation Methods, *Faculty Evaluation, *Junior Colleges, *Teacher Evaluation, *Tenure
IDENTIFIERS California

ABSTRACT

The key to tenure is evaluation; this paper is the result of dissatisfaction with the basic pattern of evaluation that prevails throughout California. The present Quality Control Model of Faculty Development is widespread, deeply entrenched, and grounded on assumptions and premises that are limited, obsolete, and contrary to the interests of students, instructors, college, and community. Alternative models go beyond evaluation while still anchored to a basic substructure of procedural safeguards and academic due process in the administration of tenure. Such models begin with a judgment of competence over the wide range of growth needs of the faculty member. One alternative model introduced in this paper is the Development Model for Faculty Growth and Evaluation. Speculations are offered on what outcomes could be expected from it. (Author/CA)

ED047669

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

BEYOND EVALUATION: THE QUALITY CONTROL MODEL OF EVALUATION AND THE DEVELOPMENT MODEL FOR FACULTY GROWTH AND EVALUATION

Chester H. Case, Director
Cooperative Internship Program
University of California, Berkeley

January, 1971

JC 710 057

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

MAR 10 1971

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

Introduction

In California, the tenure concept is under attack. In response, an ad hoc committee has been formed, composed of representatives of community college organizations. The committee has dedicated itself to the reaffirmation of valued traditions, to shoring up existing regulations, and to introducing new approaches to the administration of tenure. The committee has taken a positive, forward looking position by recognizing the shortcomings in the present system and proposing improvements, with the goal of providing minimum standards of fairness, decency, and efficiency. Certainly, the efforts of the committee will lead ultimately to an upgrading of practices throughout the state.

In taking on the problem of tenure and its administration, the committee has also taken on the problem of evaluation, for the key to tenure is evaluation, the judgement of professional competence. The committee has worked long and hard to develop positive and constructive guidelines for evaluation policies and procedures. The product of their deliberations is sound, practical, and in tune with the realities of the contemporary community college scene.

So, this paper is not the result of a dissatisfaction with the work of the committee on evaluation guidelines. Rather, it is the result of a dissatisfaction with the basic pattern of evaluation that prevails throughout the state. My argument is that current practices, policies and procedures for the evaluation of instructors are limited and frequently self-defeating. I believe that the work of the ad hoc committee, even making, as it does, the best of a limited approach, presents to community college educators the challenge of pressing beyond evaluation to invent and put into practice models for instructor development that transcend

the narrow conception of evaluation to encompass broadly conceived concepts productive of faculty growth and renewal.

The uniformity of evaluation practices throughout the state suggests that they derive from a common model. For the convenience of discussion, I will call this model the Quality Control Model of Faculty Development, or QCM. The existence of this model is not going to be news to any educator who has himself taken on the task of improving evaluation procedures. Nor am I arguing that there are no variations to this model, as there are important exceptions, as in the case where potent forms of evaluation very conducive to instructor growth have evolved as a consequence of close collaboration of colleagues in interdisciplinary programs, experimental colleges, readiness programs or similar efforts.

An argument of this paper is that the QCM is widespread, deeply entrenched, and that it is undergirded by assumptions and premises that are limited, obsolete, and in some respects, contrary to interests of students, instructors, the college, and the community. In my opinion, progress toward the introduction of alternative models will be delayed until the QCM is thoroughly studied, recognized for what it is. In some cases, certain of the assumptions and premises upon which it rests must be scrapped.

The main argument of this paper is that there are alternative models for faculty development which go beyond evaluation, while still anchored firmly to the basic substructure of procedural safeguards and academic due process in the administration of tenure. A model which goes beyond evaluation, in my conceptualization, is a model which only begins with the judgement of competence (where the QCM ends, in effect) to attend to the wide range of growth needs of the faculty member.

One alternative model will be introduced here. For convenience of discussion, it will be called the Development Model for Faculty Growth and Evaluation, or DM.

The QCM Contrasted with the DM

In essence, the QCM is punitive. It is characterized by a preoccupation with the detection of error, the accumulation of documentation concerning the person being evaluated, and a provision for procedural safeguards to protect basic rights in cases of contested dismissal. The QCM is rooted in the hierarchy of the collegiate bureaucracy. It is inclined to put both the evaluator and the evaluated on the defensive, and frequently leads to a lopsided stress on the evaluation of subject matter competence as evidenced in academic attainment and classroom presentations.

By contrast, the Developmental Model stresses growth and positive re-inforcement. It is predicated upon principles of collegiality and small group interaction. The DM reduces the importance of the evaluation process to a relatively smaller role in the total growth program for the instructor. Evaluation becomes an integral, continual aspect of the attainment of professional competence, extending beyond subject matter competence into those related realms that bear heavily, although sometimes indirectly, upon classroom activities.

Toward a Model that Goes Beyond Evaluation

It is verylikely that the best defense of the concept of tenure will be found in a concept of evaluation that can meet the needs of the colleges, and at the same time can answer the hostile charge that tenure harbors incompetents. Self-evidently, the present regulations need overhaul. The initiative taken by the ad hoc committee to improve the situation from within before solutions are imposed from without will afford the profession the luxury of some time to make some fundamental changes.

This writer is persuaded that the time is now right for the introduction of the Development Model, or alternative models that go beyond evaluation. The QCM has strained to the outer limits of its usefulness, and in some cases is counter productive. It must be replaced.

However, the purpose of this paper is not to deride the QCM or to single out for reproach those who are trying to make the best of a limited model. The purpose, instead is to synthesize a DM from the many imaginative ideas and insights abroad among community college educators and to offer some speculations on what outcomes could be expected.

The Quality Control Model

Evidence of adherence to the QCM can be seen in evaluation practices throughout the state. Probably, the QCM evolved with such remarkable sameness in basic premises, policy and procedure from college to college because each college was pressed to respond to a set of problems that became common experiences, for instance, in growth, change in governance, changein legislation. With growth, organizational control of enlarging faculties was weakened. To maintain control of the quality of instruction, expedient solutions were patched together. Needed were routinized, standardized reporting systems that would be adequately uniform and would stress "objective" measurement of those aspects of instruction most visible and quantifiable.

What can be abbreviated as the "checklist approach" (a variant on the "traits" approach to defining competence) came into widespread use. In concept and application, the checklist is the signature of the QCM. With it the task of reporting on the quality of instruction can be diffused downward through the bureaucracy. Frequently, the task comes to rest at the level of division head or department chairman. (Faculty committees and students lean on the checklist when they set out to evaluate instruction.)

With its pre-established criteria and rating scale, the checklist is carried by the evaluator (an organizational superordinate) into the classroom, to be laid, template fashion, over the efforts of the observed (a subordinate). Conventionally, the checklist, with perhaps some

accompanying anecdotal remarks, becomes the basis for an interview between the evaluator and evaluated. Space is usually provided for the joint signatures of the evaluator and evaluated. The checklist finds its way into the evaluated's personnel folder. At this point, an assumption underlying the QCM can be seen; change in behavior toward an "ideal type" (as depicted by the profile of the highest points of the rating scale of the checklist items) can be motivated by exposing and discussing discrepancies between real and ideal behavior.

There is a stress on forms, reports, objectivity, in the QCM. This stress hints at a concern for the quality of evidence gathered in the evaluation process, evidence which may, in some unkind season, be needed to bring off a sticky dismissal. Or, from the instructor"s viewpoint, the evidence may be needed to fend off an unjustified dismissal. In any event, the checklist with its overtones of legalistic documentation cannot but compromise the role of even the best intentioned evaluator. Can a new instructor be expected, seriously, to believe that a "suggestion for improvement" is much else than a notice to shape up or ship out? Some evaluators, it is true, can and do reduce the anxiety produced by the QCM type of evaluation. They can be humane. They can skirt around basic issues, deal with the peripheral, strcke the instructor and leave him feeling good, but still burdened with questions and concerns he dare not mention for fear they may be taken as evidence of wanting self-confidence, or as an admission of failure.

The emphasis laid by the QCM on the measurable and visible may account in part for the paradoxical role played by subject matter expertness in the determination of professional competence. Subject matter mastery, manifested in degrees, advanced work, in the very occasional scholarly article, counts heavily in the evaluation of competence. Yet, students can be heard to say: "He sure knows his subject, but he can't teach."

Perhaps the allure of the more prestigous conventions of the sister institutions, the university and state colleges, coupled with the visibility and measurability of academic attainments explain the over-emphasis on this single aspect of instructor competence. Parenthetically, it is my guess, substantiated only by impressions, that the increasing participation by faculty in interviewing and hiring will drive the definition of entry competence even further into the realm of academic attainment, with a consequent lessening of concern for other essential characteristics.

Faculty groups have pressed for the formation of evaluation committees to be composed primarily of fellows in the discipline, perhaps with an "outsider" from an allied field. Evaluation, it is assumed, can be performed only by a fellow initiate in the guild, because the quality of instruction is so veiled in its mysteries that only initiates can perceive it. Excluded, as a rule, are good fellows, humanists, administrators, artists in human relations, and students--unless they are members of the guild also.

Taken even at its best, the QCM appears to be predicated on the premise that the purpose of evaluation is to search out error, and if necessary, punish it by dismissal. Supporting this premise is the belief that when instructors are employed, they are qualified to step right in to the job. They are considered qualified when they have met the credential requirements, have appropriate degrees, and perhaps have some experience teaching somewhere. New instructors are hired as if they are finished products, wanting only some classroom exposure, perhaps some tips on do's and don'ts from an old hand. Thus, the new instructor steps into an assignment indistinguishable from those of the veterans, unless he happens to be a victim of the not uncommon practice of being loaded with an assignment actually more difficult than those of the veterans.

If instructors are believed competent from the beginning, the "watch and wait" evaluation approach makes sense in a tortured way. The watch and wait approach is detected in those charitable sounding words

which can be heard from deans or department chairmen, "I'll wait to go in and see the new man until he has had a chance to get things under control". If the QCM was designed for the purpose of promoting growth, evaluation would not be kept hanging over the neophyte until he had his head neatly laid out on the block.

Thus, in the QCM, evaluation <u>happens</u> to an instructor. Evaluation becomes the proper work of the bureaucratic apparatus of the college. Faculty committees, where they exist, can very easily become an extension of bureaucratic routines. The QCM becomes intertwined with the bureaucracy, with the result that evaluation procedures tend to become, sooner or later, static, routinized, depersonalized and highly resistant to change. A system worked out by one generation of faculty and staff is inherited by the next. New faculty are thus deprived of the potentially enlightening experience of participation in the evolution of criteria for the evaluation of their own instruction. Older faculty tend to get defensive of the criteria they labored on, and the generation gap among instructors is again aggravated.

Once thinking in terms of the QCM, anyone could tease out other assumptions buried at the foundations of current practices, perhaps ones more fundamental than those listed here. And certainly, one can find outstanding QCM style procedures in operation. After all, practices for evaluation at progressive colleges represent the distillate of much experience and dedicated work of faculty and staff alike, and may well work to the apparent satisfaction of almost everyone...but, if the system rests on the same assumptions and premises as the QCM, then it is only making the best of a limited model. It is time to go beyond the QCM.

The Development Model of Faculty Growth and Evaluation

The DM follows from a set of assumptions different from those underlying the QCM, none of which will be new to community college educators.

In fact, evidences of them can be readily found, among other places, in college catalogues, in course descriptions, experimental programs, and accreditation reports. The assumptions set out here are not outrageously radical, nor devoid of sound theoretical bases.

The DM assumes that instructors, like students, continue to grow. Thus, the instructor is not considered "ready to go to work", now and forever, upon initial employment, regardless of accumulated "qualifications." The DM recognizes that the college's best opportunity for influencing the growth of the faculty member toward productive positive ends will center on a process in which evaluation, per se, is only one aspect of professional growth.

The DM holds that people learn best when they are actively involved in the design of their learning experiences and are in constant appraisal of their movement by means of feedback. Thus, evaluation procedures as well as the criteria for evaluation are jointly developed by the members of the college community, including the new instructor.

The DM recognizes that the instructor grows in the domains of cognitive skill and affective learning. As he teaches, he is taught. As he grows, he changes. Results of change are discerned in these areas, among others: teaching strategies, subject matter mastery, attitudes toward students and colleagues and community, non-teaching campus activities. The DM holds that broad scale growth is evidence of professional competence.

A basic assumption is that important growth will occur in the setting of the small group. While some lucky instructors have harvested the benefit of growth through small group interaction as the result of experimental programs that have brought faculty "teams" together, the vast majority of instructors experience this kind of interaction only in department committees, college standing committees and other such pale substitutes. Small groups are the structural basis for the DM, constituted of volunteers from every segment of the college community, and including a skilled

facilitator. The groups' focus would be on the development of self-concept, attitudes, and skills. The groups are not seen to be therapy oriented, but such groups should certainly be available to members of the college community.

The DM expects that productive ends will be served by integrating the informal organizational process of the college into the formal processes. The outlines of potentially successful formal programs can be discerned frequently in the outlines of the informal processes that exist in the interstices of the organization. Much of what passes for "in-service" faculty development and evaluation is informal, and some of it is positive and constructive. The energy and time spent in the informal processes should be recognized, rewarded and coordinated to the benefit of the college community.

An example of the informal process is the colleague network phenomenon. The new instructor characteristically scouts out the social landscape for prospective members of his human network. Usually, this process is taken a great deal more seriously than the official "buddy-system" or the occasionally ponderous overtures of the department chairman as he undertakes the chat with the new man to "show him the ropes." In his basic assimilation into the organization, the newcomer is effectively left to his own devices. In time, he will draw upon his network for the kinds of advice, counsel and assistance (and consolation) that could well be made available in an in-service program cast in the spirit of the DM. A cynic may describe the network process as potentially negative and divisive. But the point is that this process is going to happen, and it carries the new faculty person over the boundaries of age, sex, discipline that crisscross the campus. However, as the newcomer is assimilated, it is not infrequent that this colleague network shrinks and the social horizon constricts. This is a loss to the college, for the process fosters the compartmentalization of faculties and the disaffection of individuals.

The DM requires that the instructor be more than a subject matter expert. It assumes that the college employes a whole person, who bears valuable organizational assets with him. For instance, the DM recognizes that the young, new faculty member can be a valuable source of feelings and information for experienced faculty. Sustained interaction among new and experienced faculty will work for the benefit of all. For the young faculty member's part, he may well resemble these vital, visible, and vocal elements of the student body more than he resembles the majority of the faculty. (Unless the employment of such persons is precluded by the hardening of a "more of the same" policy which often ensues from the participation of faculty in screening and selection of new faculty.) As such, he will be responsive to those issues so compelling to many students; war, peace, racism, pollution, counter-culture, womens's lib, self-actualization, mysticism and occultism, shared learning and teaching, and yes, anti-intellectualism, anti-scientism, activism, and the background lure of dropping out to find alternative ways. In the small group setting, cleared of the judgemental overtones of the superordinate-subordinate relationship, the new instructor can convey the intensity and depth with which students feel these issues.

Some Outcomes of the DM

Anchored to the fundamental guarantees of academic due process in the administration of tenure, but going far beyond the QCM, punitive style of evaluation, the DM holds out a promise of positive outcomes that can take a college a long way toward a program for effective assimilation and development of new instructors and renewal of experienced instructors. Being structured on a system of small groups composed of members of the college community--new and experienced faculty, counselors, administrators, others--the DM affords as one important outcome the setting and occasion for healthy, productive self-evaluation.

For instance, a new instructor might bring before his group a nagging concern that something is going wrong, that his efforts to belie his authority role in the classroom by inviting shared planning is verging on chaos. Response to the concern is a form of evaluation, and may deal with the "nuts and bolts" aspects of managing a classroom to questions of the instructor's motivations and his own personality in relation to authority. The new instructor may bring other concerns to the group. For instance, he is worried about the drop-out rate; he asks, "Is it my teaching techniques? Are my expectations out of adjustment? Are students unreliable? Is it some hidden folkway of this college that accounts for it?" He may wonder what is a shortcut for scoring examinations at one point (probably during finals week), or at some other point an upsurge in societal turbulence may drive home again the big questions, Can institutions be repaired from within, is inner city education a form of genocide, am I a cop-out? Evaluation is absorbed by the individual. No records are kept.

Similarly, the new instructor may be gratified by the success of a class hour, an assignment, a way of handling examinations, of grades. Triumphs, large and small can be brought to his group for positive reinforcement. Experienced faculty have their story, too. Some have concerns that parallel those of the new instructor. Others have had their day of struggle. Many have years of successful teaching behind them, and a sense of wholeness and integrity. Young instructors want to know how this can be. In the trusting exchange of feelings, experiences, in intense intellectual debate, all members of the group grow.

The DM, through the trust and experience developed in the small group, encourages a most desirable growth experience, that is, reciprocal visits to one another's classes on a long term basis. Conventionally, the new instructor wishing to visit another instructor has to find his way through a virtually inpenetrable thicket of schedule inconveniences, policy, and taboos, overt and covert. In the small group, the participants can

undertake as a goal a program of mutual visit and sharing of observations. Because there is no checklist, no report to be formalized, no dampening presence of "the decision" (to rehire or not to rehire), the group can develop its own program in relative freedom. It can evolve its own system of notation for reporting on observed instruction (several systems are well developed, available and easily mastered, as well). It can warm up to the task by a sequence of peer teaching in the small group, with video-taping and instant playback for group critique.

To put a DM into operation, certain important modifications in role relationships and status differentials of the college would have to be achieved. The role of the new instructor, in terms of expectations and obligations, needs redefinition. To mesh with this new role, a new facet to the role of the experienced instructor must be developed.

The QCM does not recognize the needs of the new instructor in respect to time and guidance during the initial periods of development of self-concept, teaching methods, and curriculum. The new role would provide for the new instructor a block of assigned time, perhaps 50% the first semester, 25% the second. Full salary would be paid. By this most significant allocation of scarce resources, the college would reward and dignify the new role, which is that of a legitimate faculty member, who is in the state of becoming.

In a similar way, the college would recognize the new role function of the experienced faculty members who have chosen to work closely with new instructors. The recognition would be in the form of assigned time, primarily. The experienced faculty member would come to the enterprise in the role of a colleague. He would not say of the new instructor, "He is my apprentice."

As indicated previously, a basic premise of the DM is that the small group is the proper setting for broad gauge development of faculty. The small group would not be a committee. It would be a humane, supportive, constructive group, fundamentally justified by its effectiveness in fostering

among its members sensitivity to human interactions, skills in communication, and heightened self-awareness. Forward looking industries and other major institutions have long used group process as a legitimate method to bring out the poteneial of their employees.

A considerable backlog of experience with groups has accumulated, and the literature is extensive. Precedents exist that point the way to sound practices in small group process. Group process is scarcely a novelty, though it has been a long time in coming to the academy, where the basic concepts evolved.

Building the DM

It would be indeed tempting to here unfold a blueprint for a DM, showing how all the parts should fit together, how the linkages articulate, how the energy to move the system is generated. To lay out a prescriptive, ready-made model, though, would not be entirely consistent with the spirit of the DM, which requires that the persons who would function within the model are the ones to design it.

A place for a college to begin in putting together a DM would be with a thorough examination of the assumptions underlying both models. Interested members of the college community could do this at any time. In the course of examining the DM's assumptions, contrasting them with those of the QCM, it is inevitable that there will be generated a swarm of fertile hunches, inventions, structural designs, premises for procedure and policy. Then the model will take its shape. At any point, the DM advocates may seek input from other faculty, other colleges, from theorists.

I am confident that if the basic assumptions are understood and adhered to, the resulting model will be in the spirit of the DM, unique in the respect that it bears the imprint of the people that made it.

Some Projections

Can the DM deliver benefits not possible from a really well run QCM?

Does the DM solve the immediate here and now problems of defending the desirable aspects of tenure? Realistically, can a college, given problems of finaace, entrenched oligarchies, established lines of control and power, and the like, ever mount the kind of overhaul that would be necessary to put a DM into action? Will the DM provide the kind of process and evidence necessary to handle the occasional but invariably messy case of contested dismissal?

The answer to each is yes and no.

The DM can deliver benefits far beyond the QCM in terms of human growth, renewal, and organizational resilience; but it will not provide the kind of rule book regularity, due process and procedural safeguards, the bureaucratic "affective neutrality," and routine that the QCM offers. These are seen as very necessary by many faculty members. The projection would be that the two would have to co-exist for an unpredictable length of time, probably forever at some institutions. Let the rule book be the minimal standard, but let each college be encouraged to go as far beyond evaluation (QCM style) as possible.

The DM does not solve the immediate problems of defending the tenure concept. It does however provide a constructive response to the most damning indictment of the tenure concept, that it harbors the incompetent, and that faculties do not police their own ranks. Quite properly, faculties do not plunge into policing their ranks in any thorough-going way, because the profession is not so constituted to make that onerous task possible, except in informal fashion, or in ponderous court proceedings. TheDM points to a way for faculties to assume major responsibility for the positive, constructive growth and development of faculty, and away from the punitive, error-hunting procedures embedded in the QCM.

The Developmental Model does not deliver up a "case" for dismissal. To expect it to do so would surely curdle it from the outset. The essence of the model is that it is non-judgemental, non-punitive, non-bureaucratic, avoids record-keeping, and respects confidentiality among its participants.

It may be projected, though, that the DM would reduce, perhaps drastically, the incidence of contested dismissals, or messy severances. Working properly, the DM would from the first stages of recruitment and employment select new faculty with a potential of success; the model is predicated on the assumption that it is the duty of the college to make every reasonable effort to assure success. In the small group, the new instructor is in a process of constant evaluation. With trusted colleagues, he can work through his awakening conviction, if it happens, that he might be in the wrong profession. Abundant evidence will come his way, and within the group, he can redefine his career objectives in a healthy, face-saving manner. Only in rare cases could a new instructor develop the "someone is picking on me!" response to the yearly lower-the-boom style of evaluation.

Given the way most colleges are organized, given the existing attitudes, experience, commitments of experienced faculty, it would not be possible to mount a college-wide DM except in rare instances. But it is entirely possible to commence with the new instructors for a given year, working with volunteer faculty members having high interest and competence. The allocation of resources can be justified in terms of teaching effectiveness in the long run. With the start of a nucleus, and with the firm support of power centers on the campus, the program could expand each year, until virtually all faculty members except the most intransigent loners will be involved.